



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Walters, Reece](#)

(2003)

The war on terror and the suppression of dissent. In
'Tough on Crime' Tough on Freedoms? From Community to Global Interventions, Statewatch, Chester, England, pp. 1-14.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/98911/>

© Copyright 2003 [please consult the author]

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://www.statewatch.org/news/2003/aug/reecewalters.pdf>

Conference Report

'TOUGH ON CRIME' TOUGH ON FREEDOMS? *From Community to Global Interventions*

**Chester, England
22 – 24 April 2003**

This conference was hosted by:

Centre for Studies in Crime and Social Justice (Edge Hill)

***in collaboration with the*
The European Group for the Study of
Deviance and Social Control**

'The War on Terror and the Suppression of Dissent'

By: Dr Reece Walters, University of Stirling

We are endeavouring today to restore and fashion a single outlook, a single will in the nation, and thus the Press can pursue no other end than this: its reporting, its information, its counsels, and its conscious influence-all of these can be of real service only if they cooperate in the effort to attain to the goal which is set before our whole life-struggle.... Never must criticism be an end in itself. He who frees criticism from the moral duty of placing it in the service of a general, recognized and pursued life task is treading the path which leads to Nihilism and Anarchy. It is completely out of the question that under the cover of criticism support should be given to activities which one can only characterize as treason to the interests of a people's own life (Adolph Hitler, 6 April 1933).

I'm aware of the danger of alienating an audience the moment you mention or quote Hitler – you run the risk of being seen as an extremist and undermining your argument by drawing parallels with someone who history identifies as the most evil person of the 20th century. But I think it's worth pointing out that Hitler (notably in his early political career) was a master at manipulating the media as well as mobilising public opinion. He was able to adopt policies of intolerance and suppression (with overwhelming) public support by convincing people that the ends justified the means – and the ends consisted of a more equal, a more peaceful, and a more economically robust German society.

So at the risk of alienating the reader, I think it is important to remind ourselves that political regimes of the most brutal kind have supported notions of public suppression and prevented free speech.

Introduction

The catastrophic events in New York City, Washington D.C and Pennsylvania on 11 September 2001 sparked as we all know an international American led alliance to seek out and disable networks of terrorist activity - more commonly referred to as the 'war on terror'. The climate of vengeance that subsequently swept the US administration and its unsanctioned UN invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq were criticised by various commentators within the United States. The months following the tragic events of September 11 2001 also witnessed widespread intolerance for dissenting views of George Bush's 'war against terror' and his decision to invade Afghanistan. The post 11 September period in the US, to use Hitler's words, was a fashioning of a single outlook, a time when free speech and criticism became treason.

This paper examines the ways in which critical voices to the 'war on terror' have been marginalised and in some instances systematically neutralised. It examines the suppression of dissent and explores concepts of free speech within governmental regimes of intolerance and conformity. In doing so, it provides an overview of the ways in which critical voices in the US have been dismissed as 'traitorous acts of sedition'.

It is important to recognise that the examples discussed throughout this paper occurred within a context of presidential rhetoric that was intolerant of criticism. Indeed, as many of you'll be aware, President Bush in his many speeches after September 11 referred to his government's position as the 'defender of freedom' that must fight 'evil'. He referred to America as the 'home

of freedom' and that the time had arrived for all 'freedom-loving people to come together to fight terrorist activity' (Bush 2001a). He further stated that any nation that opposed his position to 'smoke out and destroy evil' was a supporter of terrorism. His position on this was unequivocal, '...either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists' (Bush, 2001b). By implication, anyone who criticised or opposed 'the war on terror' was not a defender of freedom, but someone siding with evil, someone not only sympathetic to terrorism but united with it.

Former presented US Attorney-General Ashcroft this position US Attorney-General Ashcroft. On December 6, 2001, he stated to the Senate Judiciary Committee that civil-liberties critics 'aid terrorists...erode our national unity and diminish our resolve' (Sherwin, 2002). Ashcroft attacked those who questioned government policy as 'aiding the enemy' and mocked his detractors, saying that their concerns were 'phantoms' whose criticism bring 'comfort to the enemy' (Murphy, 2002). Moreover, John Ashcroft sent a memo to federal agencies urging them to resist most Freedom of Information Act requests made by American citizens in the interests of safeguarding the US government from unwarranted risk (The San Francisco Chronicle, 2002).

The purpose of this paper is to give a flavour or a sense of the ways in which critical voices were silenced and regulated. The voices of dissent have emanated from various sections of American society including academics, students, broadcasters and journalists and those seeking to regulate or suppress the 'critical voice' have surfaced from a cross-section of the US public against a backdrop of 'patriotic propaganda' .

What my research on this topic reveals is that free speech became subservient to governmental ideals. Individuals who elected to exercise their democratic and constitutional rights to openly express their opposition to George Bush's war on terror were referred to as 'seditious' and 'traitorous' and subjected to swift and draconian sanction.

'Acts of Sedition' – Opposing the War on Terror

Silencing Voices within Academia

Academic institutions are premised on well-founded principles of free speech and 'critic and conscience of society'. However, during the post September 11 period academic freedom was curtailed and redefined. There are numerous examples of critical voices within academic institutions bringing swift and heavy-handed reactions from politicians, employers and governing bodies. For example, on 2 October 2001, the Professional Staff Congress (PSC)(the campus professors union) at the City University of New York sponsored a teach-in. The theme was 'Threats of War, Challenges of Peace' and the forum was open to all points of view, including support for US military intervention in Afghanistan. When the content of the discussion was subsequently brought to the attention of the university administration, the actions of the staff were condemned. The Chancellor of the university Matthew Goldstein denounced the teach-in saying that the academics were making 'lame excuses' for the terrorists. CUNY trustee Jeffrey Wiesenfeld stated 'They're fortunate it's not up to me. I would consider that behaviour seditious at this time' (Jones 2001). The trustees of the City University debated what form of action should be taken in response to the teach-in. Some of the trustees drafted a resolution, calling for the PSC 'to dissociate itself from the sentiments expressed' at the forum, and to state that the board 'stands in support of the President and Government of the United States in coordination and execution of a plan to root out and destroy terrorist capabilities throughout the world.' The resolution referred to some statements made at the teach-in, as 'seditious' and 'un-American' (The Associated Press, 2001a).

There is evidence of academic dismissals for their political and ideological views. For example, Professor Sami Al-Arian at the University of South Florida was questioned by an interviewer on a television news programme about a speech that he had made in 1988 in which he called for 'victory to Islam' and 'death to Israel' (Brink, 2002). Al-Arian responded to the questions by distancing himself from his previous statements. Subsequent to the airing of the interview, the University of South Florida received angry phone-calls and death threats (New York Times, 2002). Al-Arian was placed on paid leave, a University spokesperson argued that this was for his own safety (The Associated Press, 2001b). Two months later, the University's Board of Trustees decided to dismiss him. They stated that he had failed to make it clear on television that he wasn't representing the University of South Florida. The University claimed that Al-Arian's was not being dismissed because of his views but because of the disruption that his presence on campus had on the effective functioning of the University. The actions of the university were publicly supported by Governor Jeb Bush (New York Times, 2002).

Another example involved Robert Jensen, Professor of Journalism at the University of Texas, who wrote an article entitled 'U.S. just as guilty of committing own violent acts' (Jensen, 2001). In an attempt to contextualise the events of September 11 within historical acts of terrorism, Jensen identified the role the US government in acts supporting and sponsoring international terrorism. He argued that the terrorist attacks of September 11 'were reprehensible and indefensible....but this act was no more despicable [than] the massive acts of terrorism – the deliberate killing of civilians for political purposes – that the U.S. government has committed during my lifetime' (Jensen, 2001a&b; cf Rothschild, 2001). The President of the University of Texas, Larry Faulkner responded with a letter, which was published in the *Houston Chronicle* on 19 September 2001 affirming Jensen's right to express his opinion but publicly damning him for his views. Faulkner stated that 'Jensen is not only misguided, but has become a fountain of undiluted foolishness on issues of public policy. Students must learn that there is a good deal of foolish opinion in the popular media and they must become skilled at recognising it and discounting it. I, too, was disgusted by Jensen's article, but I also defend his freedom to state his opinion. The First Amendment is the bedrock of American liberty' (Faulkner, 2001; cf Jensen, 2001b). This article was followed by a letter writing campaign to dismiss Jensen (Vincent, 2001).

Free speech on university campuses was also silenced. On 15 December 2001, Janis Heaphy, the publisher and president of the Sacramento Bee newspaper, was invited to give a commencement speech at California State University. In Heaphy's speech she questioned the extent to which Americans were willing to compromise their civil liberties in the name of security. She also commented that it was every individual's right and duty to challenge government policies. Five minutes into Heaphy's speech some members of the audience of 17,000, comprised of graduates and their families, began stomping their feet and clapping so that she wasn't able to be heard. After attempting to continue for a short time, Heaphy abandoned her speech and sat down (Rothschild, 2002a; Lustig, 2002). Local broadcasters also referred to her speech as a 'mean-spirited diatribe against the Bush administration' (Salladay, 2001).

It was also a time when comments in jest were prohibited. For example, Professor Richard A. Berthold, an historian at the University of New Mexico who commented to his freshman class on September 11, after hearing about the plane crashes, 'Anyone who would blow up the Pentagon would have my vote'. Thousands of students and alumni complained to the University's administrators about Berthold's comments. Moreover, Republican State

legislators, and business leaders also requested that he lose his job. Berthold received death threats, resulting in him not returning to the campus for a week.

Provost Brian Foster's comment about Berthold's statements was 'there are a lot of things you can't say with impunity, even on a college campus'. In a letter outlining its investigation, the University referred to Berthold's comment as an ethical violation rather than a question of free speech and reprimanded Professor Berthold and instructed him undergo in-depth review that required counselling (Fletcher, M, 2001). Moreover, John Trainor, a citizen of Albuquerque has filed a lawsuit seeking that the University fire Berthold. Trainor's lawsuit claimed that Berthold's comments advocated violence and treason. State Rep., William Fuller called for Berthold's resignation. Fuller argued that Berthold could say whatever he wanted to in public, but that he was not covered by the protection of the First Amendment, when he was being paid by the state to teach at a public university (The Associated Press, 2001c – emphasis added).

There are also numerous examples of university academics being publicly damned for discussing the struggles experienced by peoples living in the Middle East. For example, Asha Samad-Matias, a Professor of African and Caribbean studies at the City College of New York, pointed out at a teach-in after September 11, how great the suffering of African and Middle Eastern people has been. The *New York Post* described her as 'unpatriotic' (Griswold, 2001). In such instances academics were not critical of the Bush Administration but were in an indirect way, sympathising with the targeted 'enemy of evil'.

Suppression of Dissent in Schools

The following incidents illustrate the response of the public and school administrations to teachers and invited speakers, who have expressed dissenting opinions about the events of September 11.

On 20 September 2001, John Gardner, a substitute teacher at Rooney Middle School, Pittsburgh, wrote 'Osama Bin Laden did us a favour' in the column of a newspaper that he was reading. A staff member who saw this reported Gardner's actions. Gardner was suspended and escorted off the grounds by four police officers (Student Press Law Centre, 2001). Gardner claimed that the quote came directly from a television programme, and that he had recorded it so that he would remember to include it in the book he is writing on the topic of benefiting from adversity. His suspension was lifted the following day.

There are also examples of what has recently been termed 'Islamophobia'. For example, Stephen Jones was completing a 12-week teaching internship at Old Town High School, Maine, as a requirement for his teaching degree. Jones organised and delivered a lesson plan on Islam and Islamic civilisation for his tenth-grade world history class. The school received phone calls from anxious parents, one of whom thought that Jones was attempting to convert their child to Islam. Mr Jones' placement at the school was subsequently cancelled without reason. The Dean of the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Maine told Mr Jones that he would not authorise another teaching placement for him. Jones was subsequently expelled from the Masters of Arts in Teaching course, but gained entry to the Master of Education course (Rothschild, 2002b).

There are also several examples of dissenting voices from children at schools that were censored by principals and teachers who objected to artwork, essays and posters created as

part of the school curriculum that depicted or described opposition to George Bush's Afghanistan invasion. All such schoolwork was destroyed, and several students received suspensions and were directed to school counsellors (Rothschild, 2002d; cf Abelsom and Vaishnav, 2002)

Media and Broadcasting

After September 11 there are several examples of media personalities being dismissed for dissent as well as journalists distorting events to support the Bush campaign. For example, Tim McCarthy the editor of *The Courier*, a weekly paper in Littleton, New Hampshire, was fired on February 13, 2002. McCarthy attributed this to his editorials against Bush's recklessness, and his defence of a cartoonist who had drawn a controversial panel criticising the President. McCarthy's editorials had expressed concern at the loss of innocent lives, the need for caution when making the decision to go to war or not, the dangers of jingoism, and the implications for civil liberties (Rothschild, 2002e).

Furthermore, Jackie Anderson, a staff reporter for the *Sun Advocate* in Utah, wrote a column on September 18 that commented 'War is not the only action available to us. Seeking justice is action. Making peace is action.' The column was not printed. In response to a query about her column six days after she filed it, the publisher said that he did not want his paper to go in the direction that the article indicated. Anderson said that she did not know if she could continue to work for the paper and after obtaining permission from her editor, took a personal day off work. She returned to work the following day and was asked by her publisher to clear her desk. She asked if she was being fired and was told that she had already quit, and that her resignation was being accepted (Rothschild, 2002f).

Television broadcasters were also prohibited from taking a 'certain direction'. For example, Bill Maher commented in his late-night talk show 'Politically Incorrect', that 'we have been the cowards, lobbing cruise missiles from 2,000 miles away – that's cowardly.' Three ABC affiliates, including Washington's WJLA-TV responded to viewer complaints by pulling subsequent episodes from the air (The Washington Post, 2001). There were also instances of radio programmes and internet sites renowned for their alternative and anti-government commentary that were shutdown (Metro Santa Cruz, 2001; Kornblum, 2001).

There were also instances where open-minded and value-free journalism was not tolerated. For example, David Westin, the president of ABC News, was speaking to a group of students at the Columbian University Graduate School of Journalism. A student asked him if he believed that the Pentagon was a legitimate target for suicide bombers on September 11. Westin responded by saying that it was important that he, and other ABC journalists, did not have an opinion on it, 'Our job is to determine what is, not what ought to be, and when we get into the job of what ought to be, I think we're not doing a service to the American people'. The remarks were subsequently condemned in a New York Post editorial that reported that Westin wanted ABC journalists 'to be so open-minded that their brains fall out.' Westin issued an apology stating, 'Upon reflection, I realised that my answer did not address the specifics of September 11. Under any interpretation, the attack on the Pentagon was criminal and entirely without justification. I apologize for any harm that my misstatement may have caused' (The Associated Press, 2001d).

There were also examples of mainstream media networks such as CBS, NBC and ABC misrepresenting vigils and protests that opposed the war on terror, stating that demonstrators, whilst calling for peace, 'fully supported' the Bush Administration's military response to terrorism (Smith, 2001). Indeed several network executives were requested by White House national security advisor, Condoleezza Rice, to refrain from airing unedited or lengthy videotaped messages issued by Osama Bin Laden in the event that such broadcasts might incite his followers 'to kill Americans' (Fair and Accuracy in Reporting, 2001). CBS anchor Dan Rather, responded to the meeting by referring to the professional responsibility of journalists to be independent and keep their skepticism intact, and to remain wary of government attempts to influence editorial decisions. This independent and autonomous position of free speech and professional responsibility was subsequently reported in the Washington Post as a 'network giving aid to the enemy' (Farhi, 2001). Moreover, there were reports of Hollywood studio directors requested by White House Officials to commit 'themselves to new initiatives in support of the war on terrorism. These initiatives would stress efforts to enhance the perception of America around the world, to 'get out the message' on the fight against terrorism and to mobilize existing resources, such as satellites and cable, to foster better global understanding' (Bart, 2001).

There are also numerous other examples including artistic exhibitions showing photographs of Afghanistan that were canceled and replaced with portraits of American patriotism (Stewart and Brownfield, 2001). Radio stations prohibited from broadcasting anti-war songs such as John Lennon's *Imagine* and Cat Stevens' *Peace Train* (Cottin, 2001).

General Discussion

The importance of free speech in democratic society has been well-documented (Castberg 1960; Micklejohn, 1963; Sunstein, 1993). It stimulates social and political discourse and gives voice to diverse public narratives in a healthy intellectual exchange between government and society. Moreover, the hallmark of any democratic society is the reliable flow of information from government, and any attempt to stifle or prevent this flow is often referred to as 'political deviance' (Simon and Eitzen 1990). Therefore, the ideal outcome of free and open discussion is 'political truth' and that the dissemination of this 'truth' is important for informed decision making (Sunstein, 1993). As the opening quotation to this chapter reveals, totalitarian regimes of the most brutal kind have supported notions of public suppression and prevented free speech.

Whilst proclaiming to be the 'protectors of freedom', the Bush Administration has directly or indirectly subverted freedom and truth in ways reminiscent of the Joseph McCarthy era. The post September 11 period was a time when the US Government actively sought to mobilise and manipulate public opinion to support its campaign for war in Afghanistan. On October 7 2001, the day that the U.S. began bombing Afghanistan, the National Imagery and Mapping Agency signed a contract for exclusive rights to all commercial satellite imagery of Afghanistan and other countries in the region. The National Imagery and Mapping Agency is a 'top-secret Defence Department intelligence agency' and was reported to have paid US\$1.91 million for the first 30 days of the contract. Moreover, the United States Government, in collaboration with the British Government, created 'Coalition Information Centres' in Washington DC, London and Islamabad to enable the domination of the news coverage of the U.S. and British bombing of Afghanistan. The focus of these news centres was to give the US Government media domination of the war on terror (De Young, 2001). Moreover, in February 2002 it was reported that the Pentagon was planning a PR campaign through the establishment of an Office of

Strategic Influence . The establishment of the Office was reportedly in response to concerns in the Bush administration that the United States was losing public support overseas, particularly in Islamic countries. The PR office was to provide 'aggressive campaigns that use not only the foreign media and the internet but also covert operations' to persuade public opinion. Furthermore, the designated head of the new office, Brigadier General Worden stated that the department should consider using 'black' information campaigns, including misinformation (Hodgson, 2002a). Later in February 2002 it was reported that the Pentagon had decided not to pursue their plan to influence the foreign media. This was reportedly due to the negative reaction to the proposal both in America and overseas (Hodgson, 2002b).

As Herman and Chomsky (1994) have so persuasively argued, the power of government to manipulate and orchestrate the media through the dissemination of patriotic propaganda is a far more effective means of controlling public opinion than official policies of censorship.

The flow on effect of governmental intolerance and patriotic propaganda in the post September 11 period has been a pervasive climate of McCarthyism culminating in widespread suppression throughout American society. Indeed in the style of Joseph McCarthy, The American Council of Trustees and Alumni issued a report on 11 November 2001 entitled *Defending civilization: How our Universities are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It*. The report listed 117 examples, most of which were quotes, by academics and students who had questioned the war on terror. This included publicly shaming 40 separate college professors and one university president who were 'insufficiently patriotic'.

As the examples in this paper reveal the critical voice whether expressed in media, music, print, speech or art was not only censored but also actively silenced and marginalised as 'seditious acts'. The offspring of such suppression within a climate of 'patriotic propaganda' is a culture of conformity. Images and acts of rebellion are stereotyped and demarcated to a social periphery of exclusion. The critical voice in society becomes both excluded and marginalised through acts of third party suppression as well as acts of self-censorship. The suppression of dissent gathers momentum as individual acts are publicly condemned. The sanctions imposed and the subsequent effects upon the dissenter serve to raise the stakes for future critical commentators. The willingness to 'go public' and express criticism of, for example, the US Government's war on terror carries the risk of swift and severe financial and other personal consequences. Therefore, the cornerstone of democratic society is rapidly eroded within climates of intolerance that provide political actors and government officials *carte blanc* to pursue strategies unchecked from public and media scrutiny.

The retaliation of the US led alliance in the bombing of Afghanistan has been described by many commentators as an of state crime (Green, 2001). The vengeful acts of state terror are often legitimated by social and political consensus. The neutralization of critical narrative serves to perpetuate government endorsed policies. President Bush's mandate for an invasion of Afghanistan was premised on notions of freedom and the elimination of oppressive regimes. The irony and hypocrisy in this position has been repeatedly identified (see Scraton, 2001). The leader of the 'free world' has been utterly intolerant of free speech in his quest to secure freedom! Governments that violate rights to free speech and prohibit democratic dialogue are tyrannical in nature – they are not, as George Bush would say 'homes for freedom' and 'defenders of democracy'. They are the worst kinds of society imaginable. They purport to be democratic but instead are governed by a pernicious desire for power, greed and intolerance.

Conclusion

The post September 11 suppression of dissent and the promulgation of patriotism (O'Leary and Platt, 2001) served to create or fashion a single outlook in American society. How do we explain the suppression of those voices critical to the Bush regime.

i) The rise of authoritarian ascendancy

The suppression of dissent in the US, must also be contextualised within analyses of market led economics and authoritarian ascendancy. For writers such as Christian Parenti, the authoritarian ascendancy in the United States or 'lockdown' is characteristic of a political and economic structure that grants hegemony to market capital (see Parenti, 1999). Moreover, the public popularity with repressive law and order regimes is a reflection of social discontent. Hence, the 'enemies within' become the scapegoats for broader capitalist-led social and economic marginalisation.

This familiar 'get tough' rhetoric was repackaged within a framework of global instability, terrorism and the need to clampdown on internal disorders.

Recent international trends in state's legitimizing their mechanisms of social control by providing their citizenry with increased defences against global and domestic insecurities run the perilous risk of spiraling towards social, cultural and intellectual repression. As Parenti (1999) convincingly argues, the public appeal towards tougher law and order, is a way in which the impoverished and disenfranchised in society can find an avenue or a voice to express their discontent. The 'imaginary scapegoat' in the form of terrorist threats, gangs and youth crime serves to deflect public attention away from pressing social problems towards issues of political salience but individual insignificance.

ii) The rise of American Conservatism

Embedded in the authoritarian ascendancy is what Schoenwald (2001) refers to as the 'rise of modern American conservatism' and its pervasive influence within political, economic and social structures including the Republican Party, the media, Wall Street, right wing think tanks, the bio-tech industry and universities. Guided by a moral and economic conservatism, such ideology actively promotes aggressive free market policies for maximum commercial gain. In recent years when the US has experienced a number of high profile corporate collapses and decline in GDP against a growing trade deficit, Schoenwald argues that any obstacles that jeopardise the ideology of globalisation and free trade, whether it be civil liberties, the Kyoto Protocols, or criticisms of the war on terror, such obstacles have been actively neutralised. As Klein (2002:147) argues, free trade in the US, 'Is fast being rebranded, like shopping and baseball, as patriotic duty'. Moreover, Schoenwald (2001) suggests that this climate of intolerance in the US has served to silence dissenting voices across a range of professional activities to the peril of free speech and open democratic debate.

The war on terror has also precipitated a range of laws throughout America and other western nations that will undoubtedly shape future criminological research agendas. The introduction of the US PATRIOT Act and the Crime and Security Act in the UK, together with numerous other acts that address the 'dangerous' and 'anti-social', create the contexts for the production of criminological knowledge. As a result, the mentally ill, the young, the 'anti-social', the ethnic minorities, and the asylum seekers are continually objectified through discourses of power as

'the enemy within' that must be measured and managed to limit the risks they pose to society. The introduction of legislation that creates new risk populations will necessitate vast amounts of criminological scholarship to inform government policy and policy. The powerless in society will be further placed under the criminological lens as governments seek to review their policies against the 'threats of terror' as well as against the new emerging *classe dangereuse*

iii) The demise of a critical media

Media networks, notably in the US have demonstrated overwhelming support of George Bush in both his Afghanistan and Iraq invasions. In ways similar to media obsession with communism in the JF Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson eras, the media in the US have appeared to lost all sense of objectivity in their obsession with terrorist networks and their unwavering support of George Bush.

Take for example the media, an industry that has enjoyed widespread freedom to publish items for public debate and consumption. So important is its role that, ever since the United States Supreme Court ruling in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan* (1964), the media have been legally permitted 'a margin for error in the search for truth'. Yet Bruce Sanford (1999), America's foremost expert on constitutional law, argues that First Amendment freedoms in the United States are systematically being eroded by legal challenges that attempt to sue for libel against any party that threatens to publish material of a deleterious nature about a multi-national industry.

He argues that media empires in the United States are self-censoring or paying huge financial settlements in preference to legally upholding their first amendment rights. This, he argues, is the result of the power of large corporate entities to spend unlimited costs on litigation to achieve legal results that protect the 'good name' of their industry. Moreover, he suggests that in a market led society 'truth' becomes subservient to commercial principles of efficiency and economic gain. Sanford, (1999:10) argues that the silencing of the media results in the public's understanding of events being generated by governing authorities for which 'there is no more certain road to the loss of freedom'.

iv) The Commodification of Knowledge

New modes of conservative governance in contemporary society, which focus on risk management and free market have provided new political and economic landscapes for the production of knowledge. Academic environments are changing under new managerialist philosophies that require servicing a market demand. Emerging from the demands of the market is a 'knowledge for profit': a privatisation of knowledge where the academic role of 'critic and conscience of society' is replaced by that of service provider to a fee-paying client and by commercial arrangements with legally binding agreements that often determine the parameters and outputs of research.

The commodification of knowledge and the inculcation of models of corporate management within universities present new challenges for institutions founded on teaching and research and not profit.

Therefore, scholars that produce research are entering uncharted waters where an emphasis is placed on the commercial value of their knowledge. If knowledge is the key to innovative and productive global markets, then universities, corporate research firms, and government

research units are seen as 'brokers' of ideas for commercial growth and prosperity. Clearly universities have bought into this position and actively promote their contributions to these new market opportunities. However, the 'knowledge for sale' ethos does not re-route intellectual endeavours beyond existing modes of governance but instead places them firmly within the market-driven framework. As knowledge continues to be defined and recast within concepts of commercial value, those forms of knowledge outside the parameters of market utility will continue to be marginalised.

A Call for Resistance

The suppression of dissent creates both underground and visible resistance – both passive and active resistance - that provides the forum for powerful social movement. As Ferguson et. al (2002) point out, globalisation and conservative modes of governance are providing the impetus for social and political protest or what is more commonly referred to as 'globalised resistance'. As recent anti-war demonstrations reveal, social movements (such as the European Social Forum consisting of human rights activists, anticapitalists, antiglobalisation groups, unions and so on) have generated immense opposition to the Blair and Bush proposed invasion of Iraq. An opposition that continues to spark political rivalry and social unrest (Burke, 2002). Whilst a politics of intolerance may instil fear into a public starved of alternative debate, it cannot conceal injustice. The intolerant regimes of the West are, unwittingly, generating a global movement of dissent. A movement that may ultimately be the downfall of tyrannies that pride themselves on 'freedom'.

This position draws on the work of Scraton (2001) who argues for 'knowledges of resistance'. Such knowledges, he argues, cannot be generated under contract where they are often silenced or neutralised. A position that promotes critique, that challenges concepts of power and social order, that wrestles with notions of truth and adheres to intellectual autonomy and independence.

A number of recent publications have given voice to criticism of the Bush Administration and none better than Phil Scraton's edited collection *Beyond September 11- An Anthology of Dissent*. Scraton's self-titled anthology of dissent provides an unequivocal and comprehensively compiled condemnation of the US led invasion of Afghanistan. Academics, campaigners, journalists and political commentators provide irrefutable evidence of the contradictions, illegalities, and deceit surrounding the Bush Administration's economically driven and power-motivated 'war on terror'. Moreover, this collection identifies how the US Government's slogan 'with us or against us' was not only used to condemn the critical voice but was also used to marginalise neutral voices as 'enemies of the state'. In other words, to remain silent and not voice a position of support for President Bush was a complicit act of 'evil'.

Finally, this paper concludes that the McCarthyism-type politics of the post September 11 period in the United States created a treachery far greater than any terrorist network. Government's that suppress the truth, that dismiss critical voices and are intolerant to difference are themselves slaves to their own tyranny. As the 1st President of the USA, George Washington, made clear in his presidential address on 17 September 1796:

The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.

References

- Abelsom, J. and Vaishnav, A. (2002) 'School silences speaker on Mideast', *The Boston Globe*. 5 April 2002.
- Bart, P. (2001) 'White House enlists Hollywood for war effort', *Variety*. 18 October 2001.
- Baynes, N. (ed.)(1942), *The Speeches of Adolph Hitler, April 1922-August 1939*, Volume I, London:Oxford University Press.
- Boston Herald (2001) 'High school speech by peace prof raises ire, Editorial, 20 November 2001, *Boston Herald*.
- Brink, G. (2002) 'Professors' group enters Al-Arian fray' 07/02/2002, *St Petersburg Times* 7 February 2002 www.sptimes.com.
- Burke, J. (2001) 'Antiwar protest draws 400,000'. *The Observer*. 10 November 2001.
- Bush, G. (2001a) 'International Campaign Against Terror Grows', Presidential Address, 25 September 2001.www.whitehouse.gov
- Bush, G. (2001b) 'Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People', Presidential Address 20 September 2001. www.whitehouse.gov
- Carbin, J (2001) 'Boondocks Speaks: An Interview with Aaron McGruder', 5 November 2001, *City Paper*, Philadelphia, www.alternet.org
- Castberg, F. (1960). *Freedom of Speech in the West*. Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Cottin, H. (2001) 'Biased media backs war drive', 26 September 2001, International Action Center. www.iac.org
- De Young, K. (2001) 'U.S., Britain step up war for public opinion', 1 November 2001, *The Washington Post*
- Fairness & Accuracy In Reporting (2001) 'Networks Accept Government Guidance'. 12 October 2001.www.fair.org
- Farhi, P. (2001) 'The networks, giving aid to the enemy?', 12 October 2001, *The Washington Post*
- Ferguson, I., Lavalette, M. and Mooney, G. (2002) *Rethinking Welfare:A Critical Perspective*. London:Sage Publications.
- Fletcher, M. (2001) 'Dissenters find colleges less tolerant of discord following attacks', *The Washington Post*, 30 October 2001.
- Green, P. (2001) 'A Question of State Crime?' in Scraton, P. (ed) *Beyond September 11. An Anthology of Dissent*. London:Pluto Press.

Griswold, D. (2001) 'At NYC meeting on U.S. terror at home and abroad: Ramsey Clark warns of plutocracy'. *The New York Post*, 19 December 2001.

Herman, E. and Chomsky, N. (1994) *Manufacturing Consent. The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. London: Vintage.

Hodgson, J. (2002a) 'Pentagon steps up propaganda efforts, 19 February 2002, *The Guardian*.

Hodgson, J. (2002b) 'Pentagon makes 'war on terror' u-turn', 26 February 2002. *The Guardian*.

Kornblum, J. (2001) 'Radical' radio shows forced from the net', *USA Today*, 16 October, 2001.

Jensen, R. (2001a) 'U.S. just as guilty of committing own violent acts', *The Houston Chronicle*. 14 September 2001.

Jensen, R. (2001b). 'Against dissent: why free speech is important as the U.S. drops cluster bombs on Afghanistan'. A talk to the University of Texas teach-in on 1 November 2001. www.zmag.org

Jones, S. (2001a) 'Academics critical of war face harassment in US' 22 October 2001. www.wsws.org

Jones, S. (2001b) 'CUNY vows crackdown on Anti-US hatefest'. *The New York Post*. 4 October 2001.

Jones, S. (2001c) 'New attacks on academic free speech in US', 22 November 2001, www.wsws.org

Lustig, J. (2002) 'Free speech – casualty of war?', 9 January 2002. The *San Francisco Chronicle*, posted on the Academic Freedom website: www.academicfreedomnow

Meiklejohn, A. (1965). *Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Metro Santa Cruz (2001) 'Uncivil Liberty', 26 October 2001, www.metrocactive.com

Murphy, L. (2002) 'ACLU Appalled by Ashcroft statement on dissent; Calls free speech main engine of justice', 10 December 2002, www.aclu.org

O'Leary, C. and Platt, T. (2001) 'Pledging Allegiance: The Revival of Prescriptive Patriotism', in Scraton, R. (ed) *Beyond September 11. An Anthology of Dissent*. London: Pluto Press.

Rothschild, M. (2001) 'Newspaper publisher shouted down at commencement for defending civil liberties' 19 December 2001. www.progressive.org

Rothschild, M. (2002a) 'The new McCarthyism', 22 April 2002. www.progressive.org

Rothschild, M. (2002b) 'Student teacher canned for teaching Islam', 23 March 2002. www.progressive.org

Rothschild, M. (2002d) 'Student art exhibit censored, 28 February 2002. www.progressive.org

- Rothschild, M. (2002e) 'Another prize-winning journalist fired' 9 March 2002. www.progressive.org
- Rothschild, M (2002f) 'The New McCarthyism', January 2002. www.progressive.org
- Salonga, R. (2001) 'YRL employee punished for political mass email', 4 October 2001. *The Daily Bruin*.
- Salladay, R. (2001) 'Fallout continues from interrupted Sacramento speech', *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 19 December 2001.
- Sally, D. (2001) 'German teachers critical of US get 'Stasi treatment'', *The Irish Times*, 12 November 2001.
- Scruton, P. (ed) (2001) *Beyond September 11- An Anthology of Dissent*. London:Pluto Press.
- Sherwin, M (2001) 'Tattletale for an open society', *The Nation*, 21 January 2002.
- Smith, J. (2001) 'Local press distorts Washington protest', 30 September 2001. International Action Centre. www.iac.org
- Simon, D. and Eitzen, D. (1990). *Elite Deviance. Third Edition*. Boston:Allyn and Bacon.
- Stewart, L. and Brownfield, C. (2001) 'Photography museum director resigns over Afghanistan exhibition', 13 December 2001.www.news-journalonline.com
- Student Press Law Centre, (2001) 'Students, teachers face free speech limitations after terrorist attacks', 21 September 2001. www.splc.org
- Sunstein, C. (1993). *Democracy and the Problem of Free Speech*. New York: The Free Press.
- The Associated Press, (2001a) 'University trustees echo condemnation of "un-American forum"' 8 October 2001.www.freedomforum.org
- The Associated Press, (2001b) 'Colleges provide chilly climate for free speech since attacks', 15 October 2001 Freedom Forum website: www.freedomforum.org.
- The Associated Press (2001c) 'Speak up at your own risk', 26 September 2001. Freedom Forum website: www.freedomforum.org
- The Associated Press (2001d) 'Networks cautious in covering war' 2 November 2001, www.freedomforum.org
- The New York Times (2002) 'Protecting speech on campus', 27 January 2002, Editorial, *The New York Times*.
- The San Francisco Chronicle (2002) Editorial, 'On the public's right to know: The day Ashcroft censored freedom of information', Editorial, 6 January 2002.
- The Washington Post (2001) 'Resisting the censor's impulse' Editorial, *The Washington Post* 26 September 2001.
- Vincent, N. (2001) 'Intimidation is a form of censorship', Centre for Research on Globalisation. 8 November 2001